



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

PEACE AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The New Vision of Peace

The editor of *Books and Reading* has devoted the October number to a consideration of "The Rational Road to Peace." He thinks that we have come to a new understanding of the meaning of peace in human life. The average man, from the time of Augustine and earlier, has understood peace to mean merely the negation of war. The history of man was a series of wearisome and largely meaningless alternations of spells of war and spells of peace. Only in our time has come the vision of the possibility of making war scientifically impossible. This demands a new definition of peace. It is not absence of fighting but "the busy, deliberate, and persistent activities of men and women who are determined to make the causes and conditions of peace prevail in the communities of the world." Every government should have in its cabinet a secretary for peace. Every labor organization, every legal association, every chamber of commerce, every church, every learned society, every scientific, philanthropic, and philosophical body, should have a standing committee to study and report on the relation of its own body to the general question of domestic and foreign peace. This would mean the end of war, for public, international opinion would be so strong that wars of nations would soon be as unthinkable as duels between neighbors.

The task before us, however, is to make sure that all talk of a next war shall cease. "This war will not be properly won until it is unmistakably evident that it is Germany's last war." If she is deliberately planning for a next war she must be so stripped of power as to be harmless. America is fighting for none of the old European trophies—land, or power, or

revenge—but to clear the ground for the establishment of organic and permanent world-peace. Elements of this peace must be an international law administered by a supernational government.

International law without an international court to adjudicate it and an international government to enforce it is an absurdity. We have courts and governments for our counties, we have courts and governments for our states, and we have courts and a government for the Republic. We must take one more logical step forward and create a court and government of the world elected by the people of all countries to administer the international law of all nations.

This world-government would not interfere with the governments of any of the smaller units, yet it would control the only army and navy capable of aggressive warfare. The nations would disarm just as citizens do when police protection is guaranteed and sufficient. The solidarity of the world would then be no longer a dream but a realized fact.

The Mind of Germany and Future Peace

In the *Edinburgh Review* for July, Dr. A. Shadwell summarizes the views of three recent German books relative to the war and the future. They are from General von Freytag, soldier and aristocrat; Dr. Naumann, a radical politician and "most widely read political writer in Germany"; and Dr. Renner, a Social Democrat. They are ominously in agreement on the question of future peace. Von Freytag thinks lasting peace neither practicable nor desirable and seeks to draw lessons from the present war for use in the wars of the future. Naumann looks forward to a steady preparation for future wars, since in his opinion the

United States of the World can only come into existence after a long period during which large empires of supernational power will seek to impose their will upon the world. Renner holds that it is necessary to have at last a supreme, supernational power, but it will be brought into being as the result of war supplemented by voluntary agreement. War is necessary, since the power which proves itself the strongest and the greatest organizer will be called by history to the greatest of all works of organization and "by right become the Supreme Power, the judge, administrator, and lawgiver of the peoples." It is not difficult to name the power these writers have in mind. From the viewpoint of three so diverse sections of German thought the future peace-dream is no more than the nightmare of new war.

Shadwell has another article on the possibility of peace in the July issue of the *Nineteenth Century and After*. Germany is realizing that it is much easier to start a war than to stop it. She is striving desperately now to make an acceptable peace. She is not to be given peace—not yet. If Germany were an ordinary enemy it might be arranged, but Germany stands condemned by the judgment of mankind from China to Chile. America knew more than any other nation regarding the German policy of 1917 and gave her every chance to save her honor, only to be contemptuously insulted. Now the United States leads the Western world as the most firm and uncompromising of all the powers. Germany has not changed her spirit. She is still determined to "dictate peace." She has even grown bold in perfidy and glories in her ability to deceive by agreements never meant to be kept. German ambassadors have deliberately abused the hospitality of nations in order to deceive and to betray. Their sailors have trampled upon the old chivalry of the sea. There has been no repentance; there can be no agreement with Germans as they are today.

"Bad faith has with them become a virtue of state policy," and their writers even argue that it would be a crime for a state not to wage war if it is strong enough and its needs require it. The Allies will have to make Germany see that it is more injurious to break agreements than to keep them—until then all talk of future peace agreements is futile. When militarists, radicals, and socialists unite to vindicate the action of Germany on the basis of a "war of necessity" in which all means are lawful, to talk peace is to capitulate. "What is the use of talking peace with people who cherish these ideas and who are even now actively engaged in arranging for the next war? There is nothing for it but Mr. Lansing's policy of war and still more war 'until the very thought of war is abhorrent to the German people.'" The Germans have separated themselves from the rest of mankind on the ground of their superiority. Let them call it superiority if they like. It is true nevertheless that the rest of mankind cannot live with them while they are in that frame of mind. The old Spartan commander Gylippus said to the people of Syracuse, "It is, I admit, a very wicked thing to perpetuate enmities and differences: but is not the due punishment of those who violate peace the most natural way to put an end to war?"

La Victoire Intégrale

The *New Europe* is a weekly publication called into existence by the need of a forum for international opinion relative to the issues of the war. The foregoing graphic French phrase is the motto of the publication. In the issue of September 12 the editor expounds the meaning of the motto. It is to be interpreted to mean first of all the conclusive defeat of Prussian militarism. This is the prime essential of a lasting peace. Germany's challenge of the world to the decision of arms can be answered in only one way. The decision is now being given

against her. Chief among the influences that are bringing it about is the unity of command and the pooling of the resources of the allied nations. The League of Nations began to take form when a single military command and economic unity were seen to be necessary to win the war. Men will say that the League of Nations lay in the logic of history, but fate did not weld the Allies together. It was done by human wills, and the chief driving power was the will of Lloyd George. It is a curious thing, however, that he did not realize that his action had any connection with the creation of the basis of the League of Nations. Here lie the germs of future co-operation which will form the life of the new régime proposed by President Wilson. If it can be realized we shall have the "integral victory," and all old conflicts, ambitions, and fears will be swept away in the established reign of liberty and right.

Another element of the integral victory is the liberation of the subject peoples who bear the yoke of foreign oppression in Europe. Liberation, however, is not enough to secure the new commonwealth. To be successful there must be (1) the will to co-operate among the newly emancipated nations, (2) a new heart in Germany, and (3) the restoration of Russia. Even though Czechs, Poles, Roumanians, and southern Slavs will co-operate, and even though Russia may regain unity and order, liberty in Europe can be secure only if Germany emerges from the war with a reformed mind. Germany will still remain in the world after the war and somehow must return to the family of nations. But she cannot return until she has lost faith in the doctrine of might. Allied leaders will break the belief in that doctrine sooner by constructive statements than by threats which only serve to throw Germany back upon her military defenders. "The integral victory is a victory of principles, won after the German sword has been broken. Abraham Lincoln, not Bismarck, is its true prophet."

Opinions of World-Leaders

Larger significance was added to the steady stream of discussion of the League of Nations idea by the speech of President Wilson in New York at the opening of the Fourth Liberty Loan drive. While all the leaders and foreign secretaries of the Allies have signified their sympathy with the proposition in a vague way, President Wilson spoke authoritatively for the government of the United States in stating that the settling of the league plan and constitution would be a part of the work of the peace congress. The league cannot be formed before because it would then be limited to allied nations. It would be difficult to secure its formation afterward. Since the league is absolutely essential to the future peace of the world, it must be made an integral part of the peace itself. This puts the formation of the League of Nations forward as one of the issues of the war.

"I believe in the League of Nations," said Mr. Lloyd George, "but whether a League of Nations is going to be a success or not will depend upon the conditions under which it is set up." On September 30 the British foreign secretary, Mr. A. J. Balfour, took up the speech of President Wilson and added his words of agreement. He summarized the meaning of the President's address as follows:

His main theme was this, that if the world would make sure that it is going to have peace it must come to some arrangement by which malefactors or would-be malefactors are to be kept in order by a League of Nations. The second proposition was that if you are to carry out this great ideal the only time to do it effectually is the moment when peace itself is being forged by the labors of the victorious powers. Personally I am very much of the President's mind, that to allow this occasion to sink into the past would be to lose one of the great opportunities given to mankind permanently to put international relations upon a sound, lasting, and moral footing.

But first of all must come full victory and the absolute liberation of all the oppressed peoples. The ancient and the

recent wrongs committed by Germany must be set right and atoned for by restoration and reparation. Only if it is given a fair chance by the healing of these wrongs can a League of Nations work. Germany must be defeated. She can become a member of the League of Nations only when she has been forced "to change her confession of faith" and "all her dreams of world-domination are torn to pieces before her eyes." She will be powerful still, but no longer a tyrant using the little nations under her influence to serve her dreams of empire.

The Attitude of Labor

The outstanding leader of British labor, Mr. Arthur Henderson, addresses an open letter to American labor in the September number of the *Atlantic Monthly*. After words of high praise for America's unselfish attitude in the war and for the unrivaled leadership of President Wilson in the cause of humanity he sets forth the aims of the British workers. Labor is fighting for a world "safe for democracy." Its first peace condition is the restoration of Belgium to unrestricted independence, with adequate compensation for the losses she has suffered as a result of German aggression. This is absolutely needful. All territorial questions must be settled on the basis of national self-determination—no forcible annexations of territory, economic domination, nor political supremacy. Labor is opposed to punitive indemnities and to the policy of commercial and economic boycott after the war. The desire is to destroy the spirit of militarist imperialism, not only in Germany but everywhere, and to put an end to competitive armaments and to compulsory military service. Labor hopes for a League of Nations as the practical means of guaranteeing the security of the world and the unity of the peoples. The league will be the embodiment of the good-will of the world.

American labor seems resolved upon the final and complete crushing of German power in the field. English labor would

use also the weapon of political and diplomatic influence in the hope that the war may be shortened even a little. Their hope is to convince the people of Germany that the Allies are fighting for the best interests of all the people of all the world, not of the Western democracies only. This means that there can be no toleration of imperial ambitions on the part of the Allies, nor any slackening of effort until German imperialism is destroyed. British labor believes in conferences, however, and in the policy of peace by conciliation. This does not mean peace by compromise or concession. Labor stands true to its faith in the principles and ideals of democracy. It believes that the attainment of a speedy international peace is the common aim of all real democrats and urges that American labor join in the support of the policy of international conciliation. Efforts should be made to stimulate rather than to destroy the nascent peace spirit in the German people.

A French View of the League

The *New Europe* for September 5 reprints from *L'Opinion*, the organ of the sober, "bourgeoisie" element in France, an article by M. Alfred Tarde which shows that the idea of the League of Nations has become a matter of practical politics in France. The article is entitled "La Société des Alliés s'organise." M. Tarde traces the gradual swing from separate national action to unified control under the pressure of war. The military unity might not be significant and might fall apart with all its influence at the close of the struggle, but the inter-allied economic councils are a striking novelty. For purchasing, for transportation, the allied world is one. The next step must be a supreme economic council established on a permanent basis and operating with an authority conferred by the governments and parliaments of the Allies, which will give unity of credit and so equalize the burden of finance for poor as well as for rich

nations. Proud nations are thus sharing their sovereignty with others in the common cause. The world is transformed. The American and federal era of the world has been opened. Washington becomes the center of the war. The stiff nationalism of Europe, under common need and for common good, yields powers and resources which were jealously guarded as absolutely in control of the sovereign states. War has shown the value of the arrangement, and

victory would be vain if we fall apart on the return of peace. The unity of the Allies is a great instrument of war, but it is even greater as an instrument of peace. What we ask for is the Economic Federation of the Western World, which, besides being our effective safeguard today, is the only sanction which can give life and power to the future League of Nations.

An Italian View

Meuccio Ruini writes in the *New Europe* for August 29 expressing his full sympathy with the proposal to form the international commonwealth, though he is not eager to see Germany included. There will be difficult problems to settle, problems of disarmament, of sanctions for enforcing awards, of providing for the international army, but whatever the difficulties the league is not a utopian idea. "This war is a war for the peace of the world." The league will have an economic basis and will be constituted first of the allied nations and be in fact a continuation of the unification even now being worked out before the eyes of the world.

The interallied sub-Parliament, representing the British, French, and Italian chambers, will meet at Paris this fall, and at that gathering the matter of the formation of the League of Nations is to be brought up for discussion.

Some British Opinions

Dr. A. Shadwell sketches the three possible forms of the League of Nations in the

Nineteenth Century and After for July. One is the supernational power ruling by the surrender of rights by the nations. German opinion is that this outcome can be achieved only when the supreme power wins its place by successful conquest. The idea of a supernational power was first proposed by Abbé de Saint Pierre more than two centuries ago. Rousseau pronounced it impracticable because sovereigns would not surrender their rights to a central authority. Shadwell thinks that the task of such a central authority, embodied in a high court, would be beyond human powers, since it would have to make its own laws for the world, and it would take a hundred years to hear the cases that would be submitted to it at once. "Think of Poland and the Balkans and the Austrian mélange and Armenia and Egypt and Ireland for one set of questions; and Gibraltar, Malta, Suez, Dover Straits, Hong Kong, Panama for another; Africa and the Pacific Islands for a third; commercial treaties and tariffs for a fourth." Then the problem of enforcement of decisions seems to be insoluble. A second variety is a federation of states. In 1910 the idea of federating the European powers into a United States of Europe for the preservation of peace was laid before all the crowned heads and state secretaries of Europe. King Edward had warmly supported it. It was approved by the Czar and the German Kaiser. But the military clique of Germany became alarmed, and the Kaiser dropped the project before 1913. The old fear of a surrender of national rights is an almost insurmountable obstacle. There is, however, a practicable League of Nations. The Allies are even now such a league. But there can be no room in such a league for the violator of treaties. Belgium had been the cockpit of Europe, and to violate the neutrality of Belgium meant not only an offense to an innocent people but a breach of the public interstate order of Europe which that treaty was

intended to guarantee. Germany committed that offense as a matter of state policy, prepared and planned beforehand with the knowledge and acquiescence even of the German Socialists. The German idea of the League of Nations was shown by the Imperial Chancellor when he said that Germany would join the league and put herself at the head of it—and establish the “Pax Germanica.” The league apparently will have to be made without Germany. One other possibility presents itself, to establish a new Balance of Power on a world-scale by forming two leagues of nations—a land league and a sea league—of which Germany would control one and the British Empire and America be the center of the second. This would prevent minor wars. It would be a big step toward eventual union.

A more hopeful British view is that of Sir Roland K. Wilson, which appears in the *Hibbert Journal* for July. Two possibilities have been before the thought of the British Empire, that of a League of Nations which would supersede patriotism in the interests of world-peace, and that of a commonwealth of nations which would mean the uniting of Great Britain and her five dominions in a closer bond for mutual protection, that is, to make the British Empire independent of the good-will of the world. Are these two ideals compatible? If not, which must be given up?

The League of Nations ideal has been very vague. Ex-President Taft, before the war, proposed the scheme of constituting an international tribunal to hear disputes and of securing as many nations as possible to pledge themselves to submit their difficulties to that body. But no provision was made for the coercion of the unwilling or of those who disagreed with the awards. At the other extreme is the socialist and anti-imperialist Mr. Hobson, who desires an elected international parliament, with its international executive, which shall have

an international military force to back its decisions. The proposals of Lowes Dickenson, Sir F. Pollock, Lord Bryce, and Lord Parker come between these extremes. Whatever the proposal may be, its success will depend upon the good-will of the peoples.

Practically every one of England's wars since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 has had to do with the balance of power. Even in a League of Nations this fear of loss of balance would play a part. In the Italian parliament in February Baron Sonnino said, “A certain equilibrium of strength is an essential for the sincere constitution and the practical efficacy of the League of Nations. If one or two states should have a great preponderance everywhere there would be no guarantee that they would not arbitrarily impose their will on the entire world.” If President Wilson's plan were carried out, the British Empire would appear to be a colossus and must fall under suspicion, even though in the matter of offense and defense it may not be really as strong as America or France. The war may also increase the size of the territory to be considered, since it seems the intent now to load Great Britain with more uncivilized territories. It is clear that some steps must be taken that all jealousy may be forestalled if the league is to have a fair chance to succeed when it undertakes its great task. Britain cannot forsake her duty and abandon unready peoples too early; at the same time she ought to be willing to practice self-sacrifice for the sake of the world-peace. The time has come when Canada, Australia, and South Africa are able to stand alone. If they are willing they should be separated from the empire. This will mean loss of prestige to Britain, but it will be worth while if it should allay the envy which such a world-embracing empire now inspires. The peace of the world is worth a price. It would be made possible by a working League of Nations.

Great Britain seems called, therefore, to demonstrate the virtue of self-denial and to urge upon the dominions the responsibility of independent nationhood. The commonwealth of nations must be surrendered for the sake of the larger ideal of the League of Nations.

The Roman Catholic Plan for Peace

Books and Reading for October prints a chapter from Malcolm Quin's new book *The Problem of Human Peace*, in which he makes the suggestion that a rapprochement be effected between the mind of modern man and the great international organization of the Roman Catholic church. With the Pope at its head, freed from sectarian exclusiveness and become truly universal, stripped of the bonds of nationality, class, or party, working with a positivistic understanding of its mission and its doctrines in the light of modern science, the Holy Catholic church may be the creator, organizer, educator, and guardian of a world at peace. The church must be changed by being reconciled to science and the modern spirit; she must be prepared to meet the needs of the modern world; while the world will accept the church as final authority in the realm of dogma as well as the unquestioned embodiment of the true interpretation of the Christian ideal. The Republic of Peace will be ruled by the Pope as the recognized vicar of the Prince of Peace. The task of introducing it will be great, but the power of scientific education is equal to the task. "By virtue of its command of science the Catholic church, in its teaching mind, will, as an organ of peace, be able to give unity and guidance to the life of Christendom—the Christendom of the Roman communion, of the Greek church, of the Protestant churches, and even of the agnostic world." This teaching will show the world that the highest universal life is impossible without peace. It cannot live with imperialism, for imperialism means

war, since it implies international competition. And war is the suicide of humanity. Its appeal will be to the people—not "democracy"—but the whole social order. The new era will not elevate inferiors nor give "mere power of numbers predominance over the power of mind"; it will be a republic, that is, an era of the ascendancy of the best. So Christendom, which has been the war center of the world, will transform the world by itself becoming the peace center. It is for the church—

the Catholic church, the church of the papacy, the church of the republic, the church of human perfection, the church of the people—to bring in and maintain this human peace—first, by fully confessing it as its own cause, its own ideal, the natural realization of the Kingdom of Christ; and secondly, by so acting on the mind of the outside world that it may be seen by every sect and school to be the ideal and the cause of man.

The editor questions the willingness of the modern mind to accept the Pope as the guardian of the world-peace. He points to Ireland and to Quebec as examples of unrestrained papal power. The modern mind has a right to ask why the pontifical peacemaker for the world is not able to teach even his too obedient subjects the first elemental bases of national life. Moreover the papacy is hopelessly entangled in the Old World dream of the Holy Roman Empire and its spiritual counterpart, the Holy Catholic church. In seeking for a cure for political imperialism, democratic leaders may hesitate to turn to Caesar's twin as guardian of democratic peace.

Pragmatism and Democracy

A clear statement of the place intelligence should play in building the world may be the service of pragmatic philosophers to the modern world. Mr. M. T. McClure points out in the *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods* for September the radical difference between absolutism, the

philosophy of autocracy, and pragmatism, which may become the philosophy of democracy. Philosophers of modern times have viewed the world from the basis of mathematics: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz, and Kant all worked from the presuppositions of mathematical, physical, and mechanical science. The concepts of mathematics, in the form of logical universals, are fixed and unalterable things. It was a continuation of the autocracy of the Middle Ages—the sovereignty of the universal and the passive submission of the particular were the pattern for feudalism and the heirarchical organization of the mediaeval church. After the revival of learning and science the reign of law became as inexorable as the fixity of a universal or the supremacy of the Pope. But science today has discarded absolutism. The formulas of science are true in a context; they cannot be proved to have absolute or universal validity. But it is hard to break with absolutism. The concept of natural rights which was made the philosophical justification for revolution was thought of as a universal by Locke, Paine, and Milton. Bentham's utilitarianism was a step in advance because it thought forward to consequences rather than back to first principles, but a mechanistic psychology destroyed its value. Even the doctrine of evolution lost its vital value because Darwin and Spencer reduced change to the mechanical interplay of natural forces. This was only absolutism in disguise. Economic interpreters of history have done the same thing, viewing changes in the structure of society as due to economic forces acting according to external law. Throughout, progress is at the mercy of mechanism.

Democracy needs a new philosophic interpretation. The absolute sovereignty of the people and the absolute right of the individual are veiled forms of despotism. We have a tendency to "tinker with our old concepts." We must find new ones.

There is no hope in trying to define democracy in terms of ideas that were framed under the despotic sway of science when the only sciences were physics and mechanics. Absolutism took its cue from mathematics. Pragmatism takes its lead from biology. The controlling ideas of pragmatism are flexibility, adaptation, and compromise. Right, equality, and liberty are not abstract and absolute things; they imply personal and social relations. Each man is bound to his fellows by a thousand vital ties. Compromise means to recognize these ties and live accordingly. For pragmatism control is an affair of intelligence and consists in the creation of ends to be realized. For absolutism the goal is already fixed. Pragmatism creates its own ideal and sees in the world the possibility of unlimited development. Things are in movement, but *where* depends upon the creative imagination and the individual effort of human beings. The mind projects the ideal end—this is the creative power of intelligence and is the essence of pragmatism.

This creative power of the intelligence saves adjustment from mechanism. It also saves personality. Traditional democracy has blunderingly sacrificed the individual as much or more than autocratic absolutism. For democracy the settlement of conflicting claims will come by compromise, a willingness to recognize the claims of others and the exercise of intelligence as means of adjustment. "Not rigidity, sacrifice, and absolutism, but flexibility, tolerance, co-operation, and compromise are the ideals for the American Democracy."

The Church and the New Era

Mr. Leonard L. Leh appears as the prophet of a new religious revolution. His frank and uncompromising article is in the July number of the *Reformed Church Review*. Certainly the old church is not reaching the people nor meeting modern need. The

attitude of our world to the church varies from discouragement to disappointment, from indifference to scorn. Earnest people toil with breaking hearts in the church. All manner of unreal features are used to attract and hold the public, but "the hearts of the people are not in it." Over against this stands the fact that the spirit of Christianity has taken hold of the world outside the church, and under the shocks of war we are witnessing the dawn of a new era which will be Christian—the dawn of the Kingdom of God on earth. Strange to say, the church sees this current in the world-life and is either hostile or indifferent to it. Now in its hour of opportunity "the Christian church stands helpless in its crust of long-accumulated habits, a conservative force in a progressive world." The church then is no longer the true representative of Christianity. The old round of form, creed, and ceremony, the narrowness of vision and of program will never satisfy the winners of the war, who see that we can save the world only by getting down to business in the things that really matter. This means a new church. It means revolution like that of the Reformation. The old, established shell of ecclesiasticism must be broken and, in spite of pain and risk, a new religious organization founded.

The new church will make central what the old church neglected—the establishment of the reign of God on earth. Every phase of life will feel the Christian influence. All side issues, "purity of doctrine," forms of worship, sentimentalism, "heaven," and "hell," will have to give way to the main issue of realizing the Kingdom of God. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America has made notable attempts at meeting the need, but the effort is thwarted because the real power is, at last, in the churches, and the churches are conservative. Denominations must go. It is useless to try to achieve church union. The only way to progress lies through

revolution as "thorough and complete, or more so, than the reformation of the sixteenth century." The new era is here. The church is unequal to its task and unable to fill the need of the time by its leadership. A new church must therefore arise to carry forward the work of the eternal Christ in the spirit and by the methods of the new age.

Neo-Realism and Theism

In the March and June numbers of the *Constructive Quarterly* Dr. F. R. Tennant has made the attempt to save theism in face of the seeming nescience of the new realism. His main conclusions are that the pluralism of reals which neo-realism makes ultimate would seem to imply a contradiction of theism, but for the fact that logic cannot determine whether the world is of such a nature. Empirical knowledge of the world shows determinateness and order in the world. The universe is not a chaotic plurality; it is a cosmos. Realism cannot explain the order or relations of its reals. But theism must seek explanation and cannot be forbidden to say that the many have their order at last in a unity, "a significant and self-explanatory whole." Such a whole the world may be, and the most satisfactory explanation of that arrangement would be the postulate of the existence of God. Moreover, the world has produced man, who is moral; it aids his moral life and is patient with his moral ideals. Man and the world are of a piece. It is possible, therefore, to conjecture that the universe is the expression of an ethical end. Again, for practical life faith is essential—analytical knowledge fails. Finally the theistic view of the world solves in the best way the problems of finitude and contingency, of which the most crucial is the problem of evil. Evil, as a condition of such a world as ours, is a necessity for theism. One is at least able to say that realism must recognize the existence of values and so cannot exclude the theistic hope.

Have Christ and the Gospel Failed

The foregoing question is put by Dr. Luke G. Johnson in the *Quarterly Methodist Review* for July as an introduction to a vigorous repudiation of premillennarianism which is teaching that since the gospel has failed the earth must be destroyed by force. Dr. Johnson thinks this sounds very much like Prussian militarism. Christ is to come in bodily form to do this work of destruction. This is materialism and the death of faith. The widespread teaching of millennialism in the churches is alarming. It has been able to creep into young peoples' gatherings, summer schools, and Sunday schools in every part of the land. And the teaching is pernicious and false. In spite of the war the gospel has not failed. Christ shall ultimately win. It may be indeed that the world-war is the means of reconstructing Germany, the only empire that really stood in the way of the forward march of universal brotherhood.

If anyone desires a refutation of the doctrine of pessimism let him look at America rising to take her place in the world. She fights not for spoils but for human ideals. The Civil War of the sixties was a war for ideals. The Cuban war was at bottom for the relief of the downtrodden people of that land. Today the war is also for ideals. If Germany had not crushed Belgium, England would not have gone to war; though America was slow to take her place yet at last it was the call of the suffering, of oppressed and threatened nations battling for the values of civilization that brought her with her millions of men and money into the world-struggle. We entered the war at our own cost for the sake of humanity. The world-war is the highest proof of the victory of Christ and his gospel. It is foolish to argue that the war proves the gospel a failure. It demonstrates the power of the gospel and gives promise of greater victories in the future. Germany has eliminated Christ and the Gospel from her creed; the conse-

quence is that the horror of German cruelty and crime will make the nation detested while the sun shines. But by contrast the nations that have gradually woven the principles of Christian brotherhood into their national life shine the more gloriously. How is it possible in the light of the facts to say that the gospel of Christ has failed and the world must be destroyed as hopeless?

The Catholic Ideal

One more contribution to the vast literature expressive of the craving of the church for unity is by Professor H. T. Andrews in the *Contemporary Review* for April. The union cannot be a matter of expediency; it must be rooted in religious conviction. Two of these factors seem to be: (1) a growing consciousness that the modern church does not do justice to the ideal of the New Testament, and (2) the deepening conviction that no separate church can really be self-sufficient. Hence there is everywhere the quest for the Holy Catholic church.

The Catholic movement of the second century was required by the circumstances of the time. There was need of standardizing creed and polity, but it also carried the church away from the primary ideals and destroyed its true catholicity. The New Testament was not then available as a guide. Today we must search in the New Testament for the Catholic principle of Christianity. But we cannot take the practice and teaching of the New Testament as a whole. In the matter of polity it fails us. The case is still more perplexing when we consider doctrine, for the New Testament has five or six different types of theology. Moreover the evolution of Christian doctrine could not stop where the New Testament leaves off. The church was compelled to carry it on to its logical conclusion. Hence the New Testament, pure and simple, cannot be taken as the standard of catholicity. Neither in the matter of polity nor doctrine has it spoken the last word. "I

venture to suggest that the true definition of the catholic ideal is this—the essential teaching of the New Testament and everything which can be proved to be a legitimate development from it.”

The outstanding features of the theology of the New Testament may be set down as the following: (1) The evangelical note. (2) The mystical note, especially the communion of the believer with Christ. (3) The church, as the realization of the ideal of human brotherhood. (4) The sacramental note. “Baptism was certainly more than a symbolic rite and the eucharist more than a memorial feast.” (5) The ethical note. In every type of New Testament theology, faith issues in ethics. (6) The apocalyptic note. This need not mean the apocalypticism of the first century, but ought to give a vivid reality to the belief in the future life. “The Catholic Church will be that church which fully and adequately expresses and embodies these six great notes in its creed and practice and assigns to each of them its proper emphasis in relation to the rest. In so far as any church leaves out of account one or more of these notes it ceases to be catholic.”

The Church in a World at War

The address under the foregoing title by Bishop McDowell was originally intended for Methodists but parts of it at least have a broader application. The bimonthly *Methodist Review* prints it in the July-August number. All serious men are anxious in regard to the religion of Christ in a world at war. The war is a severe test of the faith of thinking people. Everywhere men are wondering what they ought to think

of God. The millennial influence, which is an utterly immoral and unspiritual ideal for men and nations, is unsettling the faith of many. The church of Christ must say with definite clearness that God is not on the side of the Kaiser but on the side of humanity. Jesus Christ is not coming but is here in every struggle against evil, here in every town renewed and every state made decent. At this tragic time there should be no separation into divisions in the church of Christ. Union should come not for the sake of saving money or preventing waste, but for the sake of saving the world.

The problems of religion in the world today require the best intellect and the highest courage for their solution. It is easy to generalize. We may say that war ennobles and exalts, but it also degrades and brutalizes. The church must therefore keep clear the higher vision and reaffirm the spiritual. It is the task of the church to keep the world's spirit steady against evil, lowered standards, sorrow, and strain.

Never did the church have a better chance. Never was there a larger call.

Who shall redeem and restore Germany, France, England, and America if not those who speak for Christ and speak of Christ with modern Christian inspiration and vitality? Who shall lead China, Japan, India, Turkey, and Africa into the light but those who bear the light? Who shall furnish light and inspiration, leaven and grace, hope and faith, the vision of brotherhood and love to a broken world except the church of Jesus Christ? The apostolic church had no larger opportunity in the world of its day. The war makes a thousand new opportunities—for commerce, for philanthropy, for education, for legislation—but its opportunity for the church of Christ outranks them all.